

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 29-39 remain in the present application. Claims 1, 10 and 19 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8-9 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,529,188 to Suzuki (hereafter referred to as "Suzuki"). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3, 6, 8-9 and 35-36 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Suzuki for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites a display assembly for an electronic device comprising (emphasis added):

a display;
a digitizer disposed above said display and for providing an input to said electronic device in response to a deformation of said digitizer; and
a cover disposed above said digitizer and for enabling said deformation of said digitizer in response to a contact with said cover, wherein said cover overlaps a side of said display, and wherein said cover comprises at least one bend for enabling said overlapping of said side of said display.

Claims 3, 6, 8-9 and 35-36 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said cover comprises at least one bend for enabling said overlapping of said side of said display" as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, a cover comprises at least one bend for enabling the cover to overlap a side of a display (see Figures 3 and 4 of the present application).

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Suzuki to teach a touch panel assembly with *exposed* sides as shown in Figures 1A, 2A, 3A, 4, and 8-11. Assuming arguendo that the outer layers (e.g., element 4A as shown in Figure 1A of Suzuki) as taught by Suzuki are analogous to a cover as claimed, Applicants understand Suzuki to teach a top layer which does not overlap a side of a display instead of a cover which *overlaps* a side of a display as claimed. As such, Applicants reiterate that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the limitations of a "wherein said cover comprises at least one bend for enabling said overlapping of said side of said display" as recited in independent Claim 1.

Further, although Figure 1A of Suzuki may show a deformation of layer 4A in Figure 1A of Suzuki, Applicants respectfully submit that this deformation is not to enable a cover to overlap a side of the display. Instead, Suzuki teaches that this deformation is in response to a force applied by pen 560 (col. 8, lines 40-53). Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the limitations of a "wherein said cover comprises at least one bend for enabling said overlapping of said side of said display" as recited in independent Claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said cover further comprises a decorative

border” as recited in Claim 6, and similarly recited in Claims 15 and 22. As recited and described in the present application, a cover comprises a decorative border.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Suzuki to teach a display and touchscreen *without* a decorative border. Although the rejection cites elements 15 and 20 as depicted in Figure 11A as teaching a decorative border, Suzuki teaches that dashed line 15 depicts a display region and dashed line 20 depicts an input region (col. 14, lines 39-41). Applicants respectfully assert that regions for display or input are *not* borders as claimed. And even assuming arguendo that the periphery of either region was analogous to a border as claimed, Applicants fail to find any teaching in Suzuki that either periphery is a *decorative* border as claimed.

Further, although page 9 of the rejection states that “wherein the border inherently serves an esthetic purpose,” Applicants reiterate that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest a border in Figures 11A through 11E. Applicants note that cited portion of Suzuki (col. 14, lines 30-54) does not use the word “border.” Moreover, even assuming arguendo that Suzuki did teach a border as claimed, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion of a *decorative* border as claimed. Further, Applicants respectfully disagree that a decorative border, as claimed, is inherent based upon the teachings of Suzuki. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said cover further comprises a decorative border” as recited in Claim 6, and similarly recited in Claims 15 and 22.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said digitizer comprises electrical traces and circuits along a periphery that are hidden from view by said decorative border" as recited in Claim 8, and similarly recited in Claims 17 and 24. As recited and described in the present application, the decorative border of the cover hides electrical traces and circuits along a periphery.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Suzuki of a decorative border, as claimed, as discussed above. Additionally, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Suzuki of a decorative border *which hides electrical traces and circuits along a periphery* as claimed. Moreover, assuming arguendo that wiring 55 of Suzuki is analogous to electrical traces and circuits as claimed, Suzuki teaches that wiring 55 is part of top-most layer 4A of the touchscreen (Figure 5; col. 11, lines 39-41). As such, assuming arguendo that layer 4A of Suzuki is a cover as claimed, then Suzuki teaches away from a decorative border overlapping the circuitry and hiding it from view as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said digitizer comprises electrical traces and circuits along a periphery that are hidden from view by said decorative border" as recited in Claim 8, and similarly recited in Claims 17 and 24.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said cover comprises indentations to indicate button functions" as recited in Claim 9, and similarly recited in Claims 18 and 25. As recited and described in the present application, the cover comprises indentations to indicate button functions.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Suzuki of indentations in a cover as claimed. Further, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Suzuki of indentations in a cover *to indicate button functions* as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said cover comprises indentations to indicate button functions" as recited in Claim 9, and similarly recited in Claims 18 and 25.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Suzuki, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of record. Since dependent Claims 3, 6, 8-9 and 35-36, and 24-25 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 3, 6, 8-9 and 35-36 are also not rendered obvious by Suzuki in view of Conroy. Thus, Claims 1, 3, 6, 8-9 and 35-36 are therefore allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 5, 10-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25, 29-34 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of United States Patent Number 5,686,705 to Conroy et al. (hereafter referred to as "Conroy"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 2, 5, 10-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25, 29-34 and 37-39 are not rendered obvious by Suzuki in view of Conroy for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Conroy, either alone or in combination with Suzuki, fails to cure the deficiencies of Suzuki discussed above. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Conroy also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said cover comprises at least one bend for enabling said overlapping of said side of said display" as recited in independent Claim 1. Since independent Claims 10 and 19 recite limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 10 and 19 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since dependent Claims 2, 5, 11, 13, 15, 17-18, 21-22, 24-25, 29-34 and 37-39 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 2, 5, 11, 13, 15, 17-18, 21-22, 24-25, 29-34 and 37-39 are also not rendered obvious by Suzuki in view of Conroy. Therefore, Claims 2, 5, 10-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25, 29-34 and 37-39 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 29-39 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 1/25, 2008

BmF

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060